



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/754,563

01/12/2004

Yaw-Ming Tsai

LEE0030-US

8217

7590

10/04/2005

Michael Bednarek
Shaw Pittman LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd.
McLean, VA 22102-4859

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THANH NHAN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2871

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/754,563	Applicant(s) TSAI ET AL	
	Examiner (Nancy) Thanh-Nhan P. Nguyen	Art Unit 2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 13 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 13 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment dated 7/7/2005.
2. Claims 7-12 are cancelled; claims 13-14 are newly added; claims 1-6 and 13-14 are pending for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ihara et al U.S. Patent No. 5,789,761 in view of Koo et al U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0259283.

Referring to claim 1, Ihara et al discloses a liquid crystal display of reduced reflection phenomenon, comprising: a first substrate (100) and a second substrate (120); a switch, disposed on said first substrate, for controlling a brightness of said liquid crystal display; a data line (112) having an extension to selectively form source/drains of said switch; a first electrode (106) electrically connected to said data line; a second electrode (121) disposed on said second substrate; and a liquid crystal layer (130) disposed between said second electrode and said switch, [see figs. 1 & 2].

Ihara et al lacks disclosure of an anti-reflection layer of an anti-reflection material, said anti-reflection layer being disposed to contact said data line to reduce reflection of said liquid crystal display.

Koo et al discloses an anti-reflection layer (160) of an anti-reflection material, said anti-reflection layer being disposed to contact said data line (140 or contact the drain electrode 142 through the contact hole 155), [figs. 2A & 2B], for the benefit of preventing reflection of an external light, [see pars. 0003 & 0013]. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have an anti-reflection layer of an anti-reflection material, said anti-reflection layer being disposed to contact said data line for the benefit of preventing reflection of an external light.

Claims 2 & 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ihara et al in view of Huang et al U.S. Patent No. 6,466,281.

Referring to claim 2, Ihara et al lacks disclosure of the anti-reflection material is selected from the group consisting of chromium oxide, silicon nitride and the combination thereof.

Referring to claim 3, Ihara also lacks disclosure of the first electrode is selected from the group consisting of Indium Tin Oxide (ITO), Indium Zinc Oxide (IZO) and the combination thereof.

However, it was very well known that chromium oxide, silicon nitride and the combination thereof were conventional materials to form anti-reflection layer, as

Art Unit: 2871

evidenced by Huang, [col. 4, lines 16-18]; and the group consisting of Indium Tin Oxide (ITO), Indium Zinc Oxide (IZO) and the combination thereof were also conventional materials to form the electrode, as evidenced again by Huang, [col. 4, lines 40-42] for the benefit of being easy to find and cheap to use. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the anti-reflection material is selected from the group consisting of chromium oxide, silicon nitride and the combination thereof; and to have the electrode is selected from the group consisting of Indium Tin Oxide (ITO), Indium Zinc Oxide (IZO) and the combination thereof for the benefit of being easy to find and cheap to use.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ihara et al in view of Ono et al U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0041182.

Referring to claim 5, Ihara et al lacks disclosure of a color filter disposed between the switch and said liquid crystal layer, and first electrode being disposed between color filter and the switch.

Ono et al discloses a color filter (FIL) disposed between the switch liquid crystal layer (LC), and first electrode (PX) being disposed between color filter and the switch, [see fig. 9], for the benefit of exhibiting high color purity and high brightness, [see par. 108]. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have a color filter disposed between the switch and said liquid crystal layer, and first electrode being disposed between color filter and the switch for the benefit of exhibiting high color purity and high brightness.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ihara et al in view of Zhong et al U.S. Patent No. 6,707,067.

Referring to claim 6, Ihara et al lacks disclosure of a color filter disposed between said switch and said liquid crystal layer, and said first electrode being disposed between said color filter and said liquid crystal layer.

Zhong et al discloses a color filter (101-103) disposed between the switch and liquid crystal layer, and first electrode (3) being disposed between color filter and liquid crystal layer, [see fig. 6A-6C], where the color filters function as an insulating layer between the pixel electrodes and address lines in the areas of overlap for the benefit of reducing the line-pixel capacitance and being easier to manufacturing the device, [see abstract]. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the color filter(s) disposed between the switch and liquid crystal layer, and first electrode being disposed between color filter and liquid crystal layer for the benefit of reducing the line-pixel capacitance and being easier to manufacturing the device.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jang et al U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0062914 in view of Ihara et al.

Referring to claim 4, Jang et al discloses a liquid crystal display comprising: a first substrate (210) and a second substrate (252); a switch (225), disposed on said first substrate, for controlling a brightness of said liquid crystal display; a data line (not shown) having an extension to selectively form source/drains of said switch; a first

Art Unit: 2871

electrode (234) electrically connected to said data line; a second electrode (258) disposed on said second substrate; a liquid crystal layer (260) disposed between said second electrode and said switch; and a color filter (254) disposed between said second substrate and said liquid crystal layer, [see fig. 11].

Jang et al lacks disclosure of an anti-reflection layer of an anti-reflection material being disposed on data line to reduce reflection of liquid crystal display.

Ihara et al discloses an anti-reflection layer (207) of an anti-reflection material being disposed on data line, [see fig. 2], for the benefit of reducing the reflected light in the panel, and therefore improving the quality of a liquid crystal display, [see abstract]. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have an anti-reflection layer of an anti-reflection material being disposed on data line for the benefit of reducing the reflected light in the panel, and improving the quality of a liquid crystal display.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ihara et al in view of Wu et al U.S. Patent No. 5,773,848.

Referring to claim 13, Ihara et al discloses a gate line (111) having an extension to form a gate of said switch, [see figs. 1 & 2].

Ihara et al lacks disclosure of a second anti-reflection layer of a second anti-reflection material, said second anti-reflection layer being disposed to contact said gate line to reduce reflection of said liquid crystal display.

Wu et al discloses an anti-reflection layer (31) of anti-reflection material being disposed on said gate line (29), [see fig. 12, and claim 1], for the benefit of preventing any reflected laser energy from damaging the gate oxide layer (32), and thus avoiding the large gate leakage current, [see col. 5, lines 34-36]. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have an anti-reflection layer of anti-reflection material being disposed on said gate line for the benefit of preventing any reflected laser energy from damaging the gate oxide layer and thus avoiding the large gate leakage current.

Claim 14 is met the discussion regarding claims 13 and 2 as rejection above.

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 13-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2871

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to (Nancy) Thanh-Nhan P Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1673. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F/9-5:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim can be reached on 571-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

(Nancy) Thanh-Nhan P Nguyen
Examiner

Art Unit 2871
-- October 1, 2005 --

TN


ANDREW SCHECHTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER